Mr. Chentsal Rao.—The claim does not seem to be justified by the principle on which the terms of enfranchisement of Inams is based. A quit-rent is imposed by way of commutation of the reversionary right of Government in the Inam village which will accrue when there is a failure of heirs. Commutation of the right should obviously be based upon the present value of the Inam, and the valuation should be made on a liberal but equitable basis with reference to the land as we find it, and not the former value of waste land and the valuation of cultivated land as matters existed at the time of the grant. The outlay on the land by the Inamdar is thus no point for consideration.

The Dewan.—It is a question for argument whether the reversionary right of Government should be restricted to what was granted by it, or should include improvements by grantee or others. The analogy of the English Law under which all improvements revert to the landlord, nor even of the Land Revenue Law under which on default of payment of revenue by occupant all improvements by whomsoever made are forfeited, does not obviously apply to this case. Suppose the improvements were made not by an Inamdar but by a mortgagee, and the reversionary right afterwards accrues to Government, can it be exercised as if the mortgagee's improvements did not exist? Supposing mortgagee's improvements and right vest in Inamdar, could we treat him differently from how the mortgagee would have been treated? In Malabar, the tenant is compensated for improvements when he is evicted. The Hindu Law generally accords with this I think and is very different from the English Law on the subject.

Dewan's reply.—(After some further discussion). The point involved is nice but has no practical significance and has never been raised before. If raised in any individual case, it will receive due attention.

Subject No. 178.
Erroneous valuation of Inam waste lands.

Summary of discussion.—The second reason why the Inamdar's Quit-rent is felt to be excessive is the Survey Department value Porambok lands in inam villages and this enhances the survey valuation. Arable waste is indeed taken at ¼th of the valuation of cultivated land of the same kind; and unarable waste is taken but at a nominal value. But even so, the valuation in the gross is much more than the Inamdar can ever hope to realize himself from the land. Compare this valuation with what Government realizes from its own waste lands in the neighbourhood.

The Dewan.—Is the Survey valuation of an inam village, as a rule, more or less than what the Inamdar himself realizes as rent from his raiyats?

Colonel Grant.—It is difficult to say. There are no data. In most cases it is believed to be more. It is seldom sup-

posed to be less. The Inamdar can redress anomaly by introducing the Survey Settlement.

Mr. Chentsal Rao.—In the Madras Presidency the valuation which forms the basis for quit-rent was taken not with reference to what the Inamdar ought fairly to get from his tenants but what he actually got, and what on a liberal estimate (erring if at all in favor of the Inamdar rather than in favor of Government) he might get within a reasonable limit of time in the future. There was thus no cause for complaint there.

Dewan's reply.—The point was fully considered by Mr. Rangacharlu when he issued the present liberal rules. It yet remains to be proved that the present rules are not sufficiently liberal.

Subject No. 179.

Excess areas within specified and identifiable sannad boundaries of Inams.

Summary of discussion.—The third and last reason is that excess areas found within the specified and defined boundaries of grants are brought to book.

Dewan's reply.—This is never done. The Government considers it so wrong to do this that respect to boundaries specified and identifiable has been most strictly enjoined.

Subject No. 180.

Government should share cost of repairing Inam tanks in a series except in the case of Sarvamanyam.

Summary of discussion.—In re tanks belonging to alienated villages,

(*a*) Where a tank is in a series, the Inamdar is required to bear the full cost of repair as estimated for by the Public Works Department. But when the village was granted as Inam, a portion of the beriz was given as Inam, and the remainder levied as a jodi. The cost of repairing the tank should be distributed between Government and Inamdar in the same proportion.

(*b*) In the case of Kayamgutta villages, Government have not remitted any portion of the Gutta which was originally fixed with reference to the beriz. Therefore the Government should bear the entire cost of repair with contributions from the raiyats according to rules. Relief should be granted as has been granted in the case of Kodagi Inams.

(*c*) In Sarvamanya villages alone, the cost of repairing the tank should fall entirely on the Inamdar.

Dewan's reply.—It is not in every case in which an inamdar or Kayamguttadar's tank is in a Tank-series that Government interferes. It interferes in those cases only where the neglect of the Inamdar to maintain his tank has caused it to deteriorate to such an extent as to endanger the Government tanks below. If in such cases it is argued that the Government should share with the Inamdar, the cost of repairing